

COLLABORATION WITH ADVISORY COMMITTEE

In full meetings held roughly every 6 weeks, in smaller, intervening work groups, and in frequent electronic dialogue, DWR is actively collaborating in a consensus-seeking process with the statutorily-required public Advisory Committee.

This section: 1) outlines key provisions of the Advisory Committee Charter; 2) describes the principal venues for the collaborative's work; 3) traces the collaborative's history, from formation of the Advisory Committee to date; and 4) concludes with a cautionary note regarding time, staff and resources challenges facing the collaborative.

1. Advisory Committee Charter

The project Charter serves as a constitution for the collaboration. It contains eight sections: 1) Purpose of Update 2003; 2) Roles and Responsibilities of the Advisory Committee, DWR, and the mediation and facilitation team; 3) Schedule and Key Milestones; 4) Organization and Ground Rules; 5) Communications Plan; 6) Membership; 7) Staff resources; and 8) Amendments. In particular, Sections 1 through 4 outline the framework for the collaborative's work.

a. Section 1: Purpose of Update 2003

Section 1 states DWR's intention to treat Update 2003 as a collaborative strategic planning process for the state's water resources. The initial work plan, included in Section 3 of the Charter, outlined the 5 main strategic planning steps that the collaborative would work through. These included: 1) Where we are now (current conditions, including a customer survey); 2) Where we are going (possible futures); 3) Where we want to be (goals); 4) How we get there (management options); and 5) Tracking our progress along the way (milestones and indicators for adaptive management.)

b. Section 2: Roles & Responsibilities

Section 2 describes roles and responsibilities for the Advisory Committee, DWR and the California Center for Public Dispute Resolution (CCPDR) mediation and facilitation team.

Under Section 2, the Advisory Committee members will provide DWR with suggestions and recommendations on all aspects of Update 2003. Those suggestions based on substantial consensus will receive the highest possible consideration by DWR. Nevertheless, DWR remains the ultimate decision-maker; consensus on any proposal does not mandate either its inclusion or exclusion from the Update.

Beyond confirming DWR's ultimate decision-making role, Section 2 also addressed the Department's commitments to the collaborative. DWR promised that its staff members would share their information, expertise, insights and experience with the Advisory Committee in developing the Update. DWR also committed to developing information and making decisions in a transparent manner, communicating fully with Advisory Committee members.

Finally, Section 2 set out the role of CCPDR in the process. CCPDR is responsible for designing, implementing and refining, as needed, a consensus-seeking process to assist DWR to develop Update 2003 within relevant statutory guidelines and timeframes. Although under contract to DWR, CCPDR staff members serve as professional neutrals in the collaboration. As such, their primary duty is to ensure that all Advisory Committee members' interests, views and opinions are thoughtfully considered, that the process is open, and that the activities of the Committee are governed by a set of ground rules approved by the Committee.

c. Section 4: Ground Rules & Consensus-seeking

Charter Section 4 sets out some basic ground rules for the collaborative and also addresses some aspects of consensus-seeking.

The principal ground rules provide some simple rules of civil discourse. Among them, DWR, Advisory Committee members, and CCPDR staff agree “to listen and openly discuss issues with others who hold diverse views.” In addition, they agree to “view disagreements as problems to be solved rather than battles to be won;” “not to ascribe motivations or intentions to the statements or conduct of other participants;” and “to respect the integrity and values of other participants.”

Section 4 also notes that Update 2003 is a consensus-seeking process: “The Advisory Committee will strive to reach consensus on the purpose, content, and process of [Update 2003].” While the process will “strive” for consensus, it is not a consensus-based process. In the latter type of process, a proposal cannot go forward until all members can support it, under the group’s definition of support. Similarly, in consensus-seeking processes, the support of the entire group is always initially sought. In consensus-seeking processes, however, where time does not permit the resolution of all fundamental concerns with a proposal, the facilitation team captures the range of support and opposition to the proposal as finally worded. It then communicates that information to the ultimate decision maker for its consideration.

To help staff capture this range, the facilitation team may use a multi-leveled ‘straw vote.’ In this technique, members are asked to indicate formally their level of support for a proposal using a five-point scale:

- **Level 1: Unqualified Support.** Full agreement with all aspects of proposal.
- **Level 2: Strong Support** for most aspects of proposal. No fundamental disagreements with any aspect of proposal.
- **Level 3: General Support** for most aspects of proposal. No fundamental disagreement with key aspects of proposal. This “score” is also used to indicate that a member needs additional information or clarification on the proposal.
- **Level 4: Qualified Support.** Significant disagreement with one or more aspects of proposal; however, the member can live with proposal as

packaged (i.e., that overall, the suggested proposal is better than leaving things as they are now).

- **Level 5: Fundamental Disagreement** with key aspects of proposal. Not willing to support or live with the proposal as it stands.

As noted under Levels 4 and 5, anyone who indicated either “qualified support” or “fundamental disagreement” had to assist in developing modifications or new alternatives that worked to address the interests of all.

For example, under the working definition of consensus used in the Update 2003 collaboration, a proposal is said to have support to the extent that there is no fundamental concern or disagreement with it. Under this working definition, while a proposal may be less than ideal from a member’s perspective, so long as that member can at least “live with” the proposal, that member’s support will be considered as part of the consensus. Members with fundamental concerns or disagreement with a proposal must help develop an alternative that meets both their own concerns and the concerns of the proponents of the original proposal. Ideally, if time permits, such an alternative will be developed and receive the “can live with it” support of all. If time does not permit, however, then the facilitation team communicates the number and identity of the supporters at each level and communicates that information to DWR for use in its ultimate decision.

2. Work Venues

Advisory Committee members interact with DWR and other members in three principal venues: a) meetings of the full Committee; b) work group meetings; c) and internet-based communications. In addition, under their Charter, members are required to brief their constituencies regularly and report comments back to DWR.

a. Advisory Committee meetings

The entire Advisory Committee meets about nine times a year, in seven to eight hour meetings generally spaced five to eight weeks apart. Most meetings are held in Sacramento; the June 2001 meeting, however, was held in Los Angeles.

In fulfillment of DWR’s commitment to a transparent process, all meetings are open to the public, with time on the agenda reserved for public comment. An agenda is distributed before the meeting to Advisory Committee and Extended Review Forum members and posted on the project web site. Meeting materials are also posted on the web site either before or promptly after the meeting. Detailed meeting highlights and full proceedings are prepared and posted after a meeting.

During the meetings, staff attempts to keep presentations to the minimum time and content necessary to allow members to fully participate in the discussions. In response to the presentations, committee members are given specific topics to discuss or work to prepare. Staff uses a variety of formats, ranging from solicitation of individual written comments on feedback forms, through discussion at small table groups and conversation-circles, to larger break-out sessions. Almost invariably, work on a topic includes discussion by the full group. It usually

ends with a summary by the facilitation team and an indication by staff of the next steps to be taken. Where appropriate, staff and members of the public also participate and report on the assigned discussion topics or work.

b. Work Group Meetings

From time to time, in between full Advisory Committee meetings, DWR calls for work group meetings. To date, there have been no standing work groups created, although a recently held work group meeting on modeling may well evolve into the first such group. Rather, all work groups have been created *ad hoc*, to fulfill either of two principal purposes. First, they have helped expand, refine and further develop ideas that originally surfaced in the full Committee's meetings. Second, they have occasionally provided staff with a 'dry-run' of materials under preparation for an upcoming meeting. Insights that surfaced during such previews have helped staff fine-tune the materials later presented to the full group.

Like the Advisory Committee meetings, all work group meetings are fully open to participation by Advisory Committee members, DWR staff, and the public. Every committee member is provided with the agenda for each work group meeting and invited to participate, either in person or on the phone. To the extent possible, the agenda is also published before the meeting on the work group portion of the project web site. Highlights of each work group meeting, including a list of participants, are also circulated shortly after each session and members are encouraged to comment and respond to the materials and proposals.

All work group meetings have been held in Sacramento. They have generally lasted for about three hours, although some have been as short as two and others as long as four. Both DWR and the facilitation team work to minimize scheduling conflicts and ensure that as representative a sampling as possible of the broader range of stakeholder interests and perspectives can participate in each work group meeting. Conference call capacity facilitates involvement by those members outside of the Sacramento area.

c. Internet

The internet provides the third principal venue for Advisory Committee work. In its efforts to use e-government technology, DWR has set up project web pages and email reflectors. As noted above, the web pages allow posting of meeting agenda, materials, and highlights for all to see. The reflectors allow any staff or Advisory Committee member to simultaneously send messages and files to all other members.

d. Constituency Briefings

As part of their charter obligations, members must periodically brief their constituencies on key Update 2003 developments. Comments received during these briefings must be relayed back to DWR. The briefing process thus helps ensure two-way communication between members and their organizations. In addition, it formally expands the dialogue beyond the precincts of the Advisory

Committee meeting room, and into a wider audience of potential Water Plan users.

3. Process History

a. 2000: Formation

Early announcements about a public Advisory Committee for Update 2003 were made during 13 public scoping meetings held across the state in January and February 2000. In May 2000 a formal announcement about the new committee was broadly distributed by mail and posted on the DWR web page. In the announcement, DWR stated its goals of achieving both a broad geographic representation and a broad cross-section of water interest groups and the public. The announcement emphasized that the Update would require active member participation and a significant level of involvement over three years. All interested parties were asked to submit a letter and supporting information to DWR by the end of June 2000.

By June 30, 2000, staff had received 145 letters of interest. Initially these names were sorted by interest groups, using the specific list of categories identified in the Water Code (Section 10004(b)(2)). (This statute requires the inclusion of members to represent “agricultural and urban water suppliers, local government, business, production agriculture, and environmental interests, and other interested parties.”) The applicants were also sorted by geographic regions of the state. The sorted lists were presented to DWR management for consideration in July 2000. Management then directed staff to further expand and diversify the range of interests represented. In mid-August 2000, a list of approximately 170 applicants was submitted to DWR management for further consideration.

While practical limits on the Advisory Committee’s size precluded inclusion of all 170 applicants as committee members, DWR management wanted to allow all interested parties to have a role in the update. Accordingly, it developed an “Extended Review Forum” to include those applicants who were not selected for the Advisory Committee. This Extended Review Forum (ERF) allowed DWR staff to send regular notices of all Advisory Committee meetings and key developments, as well as provided a list of interested parties to contact for possible periodic briefings. From the full list of 170 applicants, 55 were nominated to the Advisory Committee and the remaining 115 were invited to participate through the ERF.

The 55 individuals nominated to the Advisory Committee were contacted to confirm their interest and intent to actively participate. A few individuals changed their minds, and others were selected to replace them. Finally at the end of October 2000, letters announcing the Committee selections and the formation of the Extended Review Forum were sent to all interested parties. Subsequently, the first Advisory Committee meeting was organized and scheduled for January 18, 2001.

During the initial Advisory Committee meeting, members were asked to review the membership list for overall interest group and geographic balance. While

most felt that the already large group was well representative, several made suggestions for additions. Staff reviewed the list of suggested additions and presented it to DWR management. Over the course of spring 2001, additional members were added to provide enhanced representation and balance, until the list reached approximately 65.

b. 2001: Initial Stakeholder Interviews, 9 Advisory Committee Meetings, and over 25 Work Group Meetings

Stakeholder Interviews

Before the first Advisory Committee meeting, the CCPDR facilitation team contacted all committee members to arrange initial stakeholder interviews. Largely conducted by phone, the interviews began the dialogue about the California Water Plan in general and Update 2003 in particular. Members were asked to share their perspectives and expectations for the process and to describe any past experiences or involvement with the Water Plan or other policy collaboratives. Other questions asked members to identify which data and topics seemed most important for creating an update to the plan. In addition to describing appropriate content, questions were raised as to what formats worked best for individuals in terms of presenting and communicating information and work products.

Information from the interviews was used by CCPDR staff to help design the Advisory Committee charter, work plan, and initial meeting agendas. As additional members were added during the winter and spring of 2001, CCPDR staff arranged interviews. A detailed compilation of the interviews conducted by the end of summer 2001 was prepared and distributed to both AC members and DWR at the December 13, 2001, AC meeting.

First Meeting: January 18, 2001

During the first AC meeting, members heard presentations from DWR management and staff and CCPDR staff on the proposed collaboration. Members were asked to assess the proposed approaches, identifying the challenges and opportunities presented. Members raised many questions about the nature of the collaboration and the role of the Advisory Committee. They were also asked to self-identify the particular interests that they represented and the particular expertise they, or their organizational colleagues, brought to the process. Finally, they described and shared their definitions of success for Update 2003.

Second Meeting: March 8, 2001

The second meeting contained two principal elements: 1) review of the draft charter and work plan; and 2) review of a series of 'overview' presentations designed to jump start work on the statutorily required assumptions and estimates to be used in Update 2003.

--Draft Charter: Of all the provisions in the draft Charter, two sparked the most discussion: the purpose of the Update, and the consensus-seeking nature of the collaborative. Members discussed at length Section 1's description of the

purpose of Update 2003. While most members thought that the draft captured their understanding of the purpose of the Update, several different ideas were raised about what it meant to have an updated water “plan.” Further discussions on the meaning of ‘plan’ and the overall purpose of the Update were promised. In addition, members asked for elaboration on the meaning of “consensus-seeking” as used in Section 2. CCPDR staff clarified the distinctions, noted above, between ‘consensus-seeking’ and ‘consensus-based’ processes.

Following these initial discussions of the charter, members were asked to review it in detail and send any additional comments or concerns to CCPDR staff. The only comments that were received went to Section 1’s statement of the purpose of Update 2003. Given the press of business on preparation of the initial assumptions and estimates, CCPDR staff elected in early May 2001 to separate Section 1 from the Charter for later discussion. It then asked Advisory Committee members to indicate any fundamental disagreements with the remaining Charter sections. None were raised, and, following a poll by e-mail, Charter sections 2 through 8 were deemed adopted in mid-May 2001.

--Overview Presentations: In addition to work on the Charter, the March 8 Advisory Committee meeting launched the collaborative on the process of developing the required initial assumptions and estimates for Update 2003. DWR began the process with a series of overview presentations. These presentations all followed the same three-step format. First, staff presented what it had done to prepare the 1998 update - *Bulletin 160-98*. Second, staff members identified some of the principal comments and criticism they had heard following the release of *160-98*. Finally, staff identified key items for “early Advisory Committee” input. Staff members selected the specific items to help them get started on their work and to help prepare the draft *Assumptions and Estimates* report.

After each presentation, Advisory Committee members were given substantial opportunity to ask questions for clarification as well as to generate additional suggestions for “early input” items. At the end of the meeting, Advisory Committee members were invited to join one or more of eight initial Work Groups. These groups, to be composed of DWR staff, Advisory Committee members and interested members of the public, would meet, during March and April 2001, to develop more focused proposals for these items for early Advisory Committee input.

Spring 2001 Work Groups

At the March 8, 2001, meeting, DWR asked AC members to join one or more of eight initial work groups: Agricultural Water Use, Environmental Water Use, Urban Water Use, Assumptions and Estimates Report, Other Planning Processes, Water Supplies and Balances, Framework Matters and Economics. The goal of these work groups was to develop, for review by the full AC during its April 25th and May 3rd, 2001, meetings, proposals on matters requiring early input.

Between March 19 and March 30, 2001 the eight initial Work Groups each met for roughly three hours. In total, over 40 Advisory Committee members, joined by additional interested members of the public, met with more than 30 DWR staff members. The meetings generally followed a similar format. Work Group members first reviewed the lists of questions for early input, arranged topically, that DWR staff had compiled from the presentations and discussions at the March 8, 2001 Advisory Committee meeting. Members then added and discussed additional questions for early input. Finally, as time permitted, members were asked to help staff prioritize the early input questions.

Following the initial Work Group meetings, DWR staff prepared draft "Discussion Papers" on the prioritized list of early input matters. The draft Discussion Papers identified specific potential strategies for addressing the early input matters, and outlined the advantages and disadvantages of each potential strategy.

At three follow-up meetings held between April 17 and 20, 2001 DWR staff and Work Group members discussed the draft Discussion Papers. One meeting was devoted to discussing the "Framework Assumptions" for *Update 2003*. At the other two meetings, Work Group members discussed detailed elements of alternative approaches for describing *current* water uses and supplies - "where we are now," as well as some of the initial elements for describing *future* water supplies and uses - "where we are going."

These three follow-up Work Group meetings all followed the same general format. Following presentation by DWR staff on a particular topic, Work Group members were given the opportunity to ask questions for clarification. After these questions, members were asked to expand the list of potential approaches to the matters for early input. Finally, members were asked to discuss the advantages and disadvantages of the potential approaches. At the end of this discussion, consensus was sought on a specific proposal to be taken to the full Advisory Committee at its April 25 and May 3 meetings. In all cases, the Work Groups were able to reach consensus on a suggested proposal.

Third and Fourth Meetings: April 25 and May 3, 2001

Following the initial Work Group meetings, DWR staff revised the draft Discussion Papers to incorporate the Work Group's insights and proposals. The revised papers were specifically keyed to agenda items for the April 25th and May 3rd Advisory Committee meetings. At those two meetings, DWR staff made presentations on the Work Group proposals to the Advisory Committee members. Shortly after both meetings, absent members were emailed meeting summaries and suggestions made at the meetings. They were given an opportunity to express their support or concerns. No one raised any fundamental disagreement.

The April 25th and May 3rd meetings were the first occasions for CCPDR and DWR staff to seek formal consensus among Advisory Committee members. During that meeting, depending upon the apparent level of support for a proposal indicated by the discussion, staff used several different techniques. For several matters, where the initial discussions during the meetings raised no concerns

with a work group or staff proposal, members were simply asked to indicate whether there was any fundamental disagreement with the proposal. For others, where the discussions indicated a wider range of support for a proposal, a 'straw vote' was conducted.

By the end of the April 25 and May 3 meetings, the Advisory Committee had developed eight consensus or near-consensus items of recommendation for DWR. These recommendations include:

1. Prepare "Water Portfolios" for each hydrologic region and statewide.
2. Describe "Where We Are Now" using actual data for multiple years.
3. Present water balance data for unique areas (Mountain Counties) and counties.
4. Consider Planning Horizons 2010, 2020, 2030, and 2050.
5. Consider a range of hydrologies from wet to dry for "Where We Are Going."
6. Consider a list of "Key Drivers and Constraints" for planning for the future.
7. Improve Agricultural Water Use data; use existing ETAW data.
8. Improve Urban Landscape Water Use estimates.

For seven of these eight suggestions, there were no fundamental concerns raised with the final proposal. For one—number three—all but two members supported the proposal.

DWR review and response

DWR staff Work Teams met during the weeks of May 7 and 14. On May 21, DWR staff held an all-day Project Team meeting to further discuss the Advisory Committee suggestions. During these meetings, staff considered the implications on DWR program resources of adopting the suggestions. Staff also considered the impacts on statutory and other internal deadlines. On May 30, DWR staff held a final Project Team meeting to review these impacts and implications.

DWR staff and the facilitation team prepared a report, with direction from DWR management, for presentation at the June 20th Advisory Committee meeting. The report set out how DWR would incorporate the initial suggestions arising from the collaboration with Advisory Committee members, with the awareness that many additional suggestions will be developed in the coming months and years.

Fifth Meeting: June 20, 2001

The fifth meeting, held in Los Angeles, was the first meeting held outside of Sacramento. Three principal items of business occurred. First, three experts

spoke on the potential impacts for California water resources of global climate change. Advisory Committee members discussed the challenges and opportunities posed by climate change for Update 2003. Second, DWR presented highlights of its responses to the eight Advisory Committee suggestions. Overall, the Advisory Committee's suggestions were well received and supported by the Department. Staff proposed some slight refinements as well as an initial approach and draft work sequence for addressing each Advisory Committee recommendation. Finally, following a discussion of different approaches to considering the future, Advisory Committee members conceived what became known as the "study plan" process. The proposed three-step framework would have the collaborative: 1) develop 'important factors' that might impact future water supplies or uses; 2) set different ranges for these factors, while indicating the sequence of events that would have to occur to make such ranges plausible; and 3) evaluate specific combinations of factors and ranges under specific criteria.

At the end of the meeting, staff proposed that a summer work group would draft a list of important factors and ranges of plausible values. The draft would be presented to the Advisory Committee for discussion at its September 7 meeting.

Summer 2001 Work Groups

During summer 2001, two work groups and a drafting subcommittee held a total of eight meetings. In addition, DWR staff put on a 'modeling workshop' for interested Advisory Committee members and other modeling experts.

--Assumptions Work Group

On July 20th, sixteen Advisory Committee members and eight staff members met for additional discussions about the assumptions about the future. This group worked under the title, "Assumptions—Where we are going Work Group," or "Assumptions Work Group" for short. After substantial discussion, the work group confirmed that the "important factors" idea provided a useful framework for beginning to identify and develop the assumptions and estimates about "where we are going." Participants, however, felt that the broad categories sketched in the initial group of factors needed to be refined extensively to reflect the Burton Bill requirements and other useful subcategories. They also felt that staff should incorporate, wherever relevant, both the expanded Water Portfolio categories presented by staff during the June 20th meeting and the draft list of "Key Drivers and Constraints" developed by the Advisory Committee during the May 3rd committee meeting.

Finally, the work group recommended that a smaller subcommittee should meet to begin developing a both a more complete list of factors and a very rough draft of the ranges and values associated with each of the "important factors" for "where we are going." This 'rough, rough' draft would be sent out by e-mail to the full Advisory Committee in August. Comments would then be assembled into an annotated, revised "rough" draft and reviewed at the next scheduled meetings of the entire Assumptions Work Group on August 28th and 30th. The draft

emerging out of these late August work group meetings would be reviewed by the full AC at its September 7th meeting.

--Drafting Subcommittee

The Work Group members who proposed this plan thought that a smaller subcommittee composed of staff and Advisory Committee members could work more efficiently. They also felt, however, that the subcommittee needed to have a broad enough range of perspectives and expertise to attempt to anticipate as many interests and concerns of Advisory Committee members as possible with the factors and their potential ranges. They felt that the initial group of six Advisory Committee members who had developed the study plan framework was a good start at finding a small but balanced group of members.

Following the July 20th, meeting, the work group's suggestions were communicated to the full Advisory Committee. Members of the full Advisory Committee were asked to communicate any fundamental concerns with the subcommittee approach. The few principal concerns raised involved balance and openness.

To address balance, the facilitation team contacted the six members who had originally proposed the study plan framework at the June 20th AC meeting. When only three of the six could confirm participation, the facilitation team sought participation from additional members who had identified themselves, at the January 2001 meeting, as representing particular perspectives. Additional participation was secured.

To address openness, the facilitation team assured Advisory Committee members that all subcommittee meetings would be open to anyone who wished to participate; that agenda items would be announced in advance and highlights communicated shortly after the meeting; and that nothing suggested by the subcommittee, or the Assumptions Work Group itself, would in any way purport to bind the full Advisory Committee when it met to consider the 'rough draft' in September.

The subcommittee met four times (August 3rd, 10th, 17th and 24th) to further develop the "important factors" list. Each meeting focused on particular groupings of factors, so that those Advisory Committee members interested in specific factors could call in or attend a particular session. At these meetings, each factor was identified and discussed in terms of likely qualitative ranges or values that might describe conditions for a particular factor. A chart emerged that helped participants think through the following points for each factor: the ranges for each factor; considerations related to those ranges; potentially relevant planning horizons; and relationship to modeling tools.

The subcommittee's draft was reviewed by the Assumptions work group on August 28th and 30th; and finalized into a draft Assumptions Table for the September 7th full Advisory Committee meeting.

--Water Portfolio Work Group

On August 8th, a second summer work group met. This group addressed staff work over the early summer on the “water portfolio” and “flow chart” diagram presented during the June 20th AC meeting. Participants made numerous suggestions for further refinement of the categories reported. In addition, participants heard about DWR’s plans for using IDEF0 “process-maps.”

--Modeling Workshop

On August 28th, DWR held a modeling workshop. The workshop was attended by a half-dozen Advisory Committee members and more than two dozen modeling experts from DWR and other government agencies. During the workshop, experts presented overview presentations on CALFED modeling, on the San Joaquin Valley integrated climate change modeling, and CALVIN. In addition, DWR gave its first public presentation of its ‘straw proposal’ for using modeling tools in Update 2003.

Sixth Meeting: September 7, 2001

The sixth meeting presented the results of the summer work for the full Advisory Committee’s review. During the morning and early afternoon sessions, participants looked at the rough draft ‘factors’ and ‘ranges’ developed by the Assumptions Work Group and its drafting subcommittee. During the remainder of the meeting, participants considered materials reviewed by the Water Portfolio Work group.

In the first portion of the meeting, following the approach used by the drafting subcommittee, factor presentations and discussions were grouped topically. Accompanying worksheet and feedback forms identified the considerations that work group members used for developing possible ranges. During the meeting, in a series of facilitated break-out sessions, the Advisory Committee reviewed the factors and associated qualitative ranges and provided feedback and additional refinements. Over 500 individual comments were received.

In the afternoon session, participants reviewed the substantial work done on the Water Portfolio. In addition, they addressed several items believed by staff to need additional attention. Finally, they spoke approvingly of DWR’s decision to document and daylight the process by using IDEF0 process-maps.

Following the meeting, staff worked hard at revising the important factors and qualitative ranges to respond to the September 7th comments. In addition, to help ‘test’ the usefulness of the draft factor and range combinations, a Work Group met on September 25th. During this Work Group meeting, participants individually built sets of factors and ranges, grouped around specific themes, into possible “study plans.” They then compared notes on the approaches that they had taken and the overall usefulness of the then-existing set of factors and ranges.

Seventh Meeting: October 3, 2001

The October 3rd meeting was the first of two held in October 2001. The meeting had two principal focal points: 1) assembly of possible study plans; and 2) further

refinement and then consensus-seeking on an initial group of study plan “building blocks,” i.e., important factors and qualitative ranges.

First, at the start of the meeting, four members who had participated in the September 25th Work Group meeting described their individual approaches to assembling the play sheets. Their strategies included: developing a likely base case from present trends continued and then creating variations of that base case; creating a study plan to describe desired future conditions; to thinking about worst case or stressed conditions, both state wide and within specific regions.

Advisory Committee members, staff and members of the public were then asked to develop their own possible study plans, using the ‘play sheets’ provided as templates. These ‘play sheets’ listed all of the then-existing draft factors and ranges. After working with the play sheets, participants were asked to discuss their different approaches. They were specifically asked not to emphasize commonality at this point in the process; rather, they were encouraged to value the insights that their different perspectives provided on possible study plan assembly.

After this initial study plan assembly exercise, participants turned their attention to staff’s work to refine the building blocks in response to the 500 comments received September 7th. After sifting through all the comments submitted by Advisory Committee members, staff presented some new potential factors and ranges; explained its proposal to split three factors into three pairs of two factors; and proposed some new ranges. In addition, staff presented draft factor definitions and rough draft evaluation criteria for initial discussion. Finally, staff addressed perhaps the largest group of comments received September 7th. Most of those comments proposed additional “considerations” that study plan developers should keep in mind. Commenters wanted these qualifications to be considered either when qualitative ranges were “quantified,” or when study plan developers were considering the assembly of their plans. In response to these many comments, staff proposed removing the ever-growing list of “considerations for assigning ranges” from the play sheets. Instead, for each important factor and qualitative range, staff would develop expanded narratives and graphics to illustrate the matters that might affect a particular factor, and their subsequent influence on related or linked factors.

Participants then worked within small groups at their tables to consider if any “building blocks” were missing. They then identified the group of building blocks that they felt was ready to move onto quantification and the group which needed additional work. Following reports from each of the tables, recorded on a large multi-paged wall chart, it was clear that about half of the factor and qualitative ranges were ready for quantification, and about half needed more work.

Eighth Meeting: October 25, 2001

During the October 25th meeting, members took time to more fully explore their different approaches to developing study plans. In addition, staff gave a preview of the work expected to be completed, by January 1, 2002, on the initial

assumptions and estimates for Update 2003. Further work occurred on the draft evaluation criteria. Finally, consensus was sought and obtained on a second group of building blocks, and additional comments received on the remaining group.

The meeting began with a follow-up to the October 3rd 'play sheet' exercise. Based on the study plan themes participants in that exercise had created, staff had identified five possible "conversation circles." Each of these circles represented a different approach taken to the assembly of possible study plans. The circles were: Regional Focus; Stressed Conditions; Baseline Conditions; Preferred Future; Most Likely Future; and Other Approaches. Participants were asked to seat themselves at one conversation circle of their choosing. Within these groups, participants were asked to identify: 1) the challenges and opportunities presented by their particular approach; and 2) the next steps needed to be taken to develop a discrete number of study plans.

DWR then presented an outline of the likely contents of the assumptions and estimates web site. Meeting participants were asked to give their perspective on how staff might prioritize its work over the remaining course of the year. These comments were recorded and compiled by the facilitation team and later presented to staff for its review. The facilitation team later communicated staff's response to the Advisory Committee.

As for the evaluation criteria, in response to comments raised during the October 3rd meeting, staff reiterated the evaluation criteria's role. As explained by staff with the help of a chart developed by an Advisory Committee member, evaluation criteria should do three things: 1) provide insights into the predictable effects resulting from study plan implementation; 2) indicate the relative feasibility of selected actions; and 3) help outline the ability of a study plan to meet various objectives. Participants then discussed whether any important criteria were missing and also developed suggestions for improving the evaluation criteria.

Finally, in the last piece of the afternoon's business, Advisory Committee members worked through the revised building blocks. After presentation and discussion, a second group of blocks was formally identified as consensus candidates for quantification.

November Work Groups

In November, the two final work group meetings for 2001 were held.

The Modeling Work Group met November 15th. Participating with staff in this group were Advisory Committee members who had identified themselves in the October AC meetings as comfortable with modeling tools. During this first of what will likely be more meetings of this group, participants discussed ways to link available modeling tools with the 'water portfolios' and 'study plans.' Detailed presentations were also made on one particular model—CALSIM2.

The Assumptions Work Group met November 26th. It considered two principal agenda items: 1) next steps in the study plan process; and 2) incorporation of a regional approach in Update 2003. For the study plan process, participants

suggested that Advisory Committee members concentrate on identifying the themes that they want to study, and get agreement on the themes that were most important. For the regional approach, prompted by the recently-enacted Machado bill, participants discussed the letter and the spirit of the bill's emphasis on maximization of local supplies and demand management strategies. One suggestion that emerged was the creation of a "Machado bill study plan." They also discussed the challenges of integrating regional and state-wide studies into a "California Water Plan." Some challenges noted included: 1) an imbalance among the Advisory Committee in terms of available members from different planning regions; 2) the mechanics of integration or reconciliation of different assumptions made by different regions into a single, coherent statewide picture; and 3) Where and how to plan "top-down" to integrate statewide values and interests. The meeting ended with a call to identify other major items of potential concern raised by a bottom-up, integration of regional plans.

Ninth Meeting: December 13, 2001

The final meeting of the collaboration's first year addressed the remaining group of building blocks; toured the then-still-under-construction assumptions and estimates web site; reached agreement in principle on the draft preface to the web site; and previewed a draft 2002 work plan.

In the first part of the morning session, staff presented revisions to the remaining seven groups of building blocks. Consensus or near consensus was obtained on several more blocks and on three staff 'straw proposals' that sought to ascertain areas of substantial agreement on three large groups of remaining blocks. Additional work was identified on the remaining handful of blocks.

Following a thirty minute tour of the web site, Advisory Committee members reviewed the site's preface/home page in depth. About 20 comments were made. The year ended almost as it began, with a detailed discussion about the purpose of Update 2003 and the role of consensus-seeking in its development. Deputy director Jonas Minton then proposed language to address the principal comments made. Subject to their ability to review the final version of the draft, members present agreed in principle that the preface fairly described Update 2003 and the collaboration.

4. Challenges Remaining to the Collaboration: *Time and Resource Limitations, Commitment to Further Dialogue*

As noted in the 40 page report presented to the Advisory Committee during its June 20, 2001, meeting, limitations on available time and on staffing and resources may pose real challenges to DWR's ability to implement fully the Advisory Committee's suggestions for *Update 2003*.

To help manage this apparent conflict between desired products in *Update 2003* and available time and resources, and in keeping with its commitment to an open and transparent stakeholder collaboration, DWR has promised to communicate with the Advisory Committee when significant staffing and resources challenges appear. It will solicit the Committee's input on priorities and level of detail. DWR

staff and Advisory Committee members can then explore the specific challenge(s) together and attempt to develop solutions to meet the interests of DWR and the Advisory Committee.

As an example of this, during the October 25th meeting, Advisory Committee members were asked to help prioritize DWR's work load for developing the draft Assumptions and Estimates report. Members reviewed and commended the Department's work products and provided strategic perspectives for next steps. Similar prioritizations and reprioritizations will likely occur repeatedly during the remainder of the Update 2003 collaborative.